

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the claims under 35 USC §101 and under 35 USC §103. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

The claims have been amended to correct minor informalities and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 14-17 have been added. Claims 1-5, 7, and 14 are now pending. In addition, a few minor amendments have been made to the Abstract to reduce its length.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-18 UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable MWS in view of News Release, and further in view of Provilus. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Claim 1, as amended, pertains to a method of distributing data in a computer system for use in a catalog, comprising:

capturing product data for a plurality of products ~~a product~~ according to a data model, the data model having one or more classes, each one of the one or more classes being defined by one or more categories, each of the one or more categories being defined by an attribute group having one or more attributes; and

storing the product data, wherein the stored product data is suitable for use in an electronic catalog;

receiving a customer profile from one or more customers, each customer profile indicating one or more of the plurality of products for which product data is to be transmitted to the corresponding customer for use in generating a catalog;

receiving a set of language selections from one or more of the customers indicating one or more languages in which the product data is to be transmitted to the corresponding one of the customers; and

storing the set of language selections for each of the customers such that the set of language selections is associated with the corresponding customer profile; and

providing distributing the product data in accordance with the customer profile to each of the one or more customers in the one or more languages indicated in the corresponding set of language selections, wherein the product data is suitable for use in an electronic catalog.

None of the cited references discloses or suggests the claimed invention. While multilingual web sites are in existence, none of the art discloses or suggests capturing product data suitable for use in an electronic catalog and distributing product data for those products specified in a customer profile associated with each customer. Moreover, none of

thereferences discloses or suggests storing a set of language selections in association with the customer profile, where the language selections indicate languages in which the product data is to be transmitted to the corresponding customer. In other words, none of the references discloses or suggests distributing data for use in generating a catalog; they merely teach providing a catalog to an end user.

Rather, item X, pages 3 and 4 teaches that a catalog may be provided to a single user, who may receive a customized catalog from a particular manufacturer (e.g., HP). Similarly, Provilus teaches publishing an online catalog electronically to enable customer searches. Thus, the cited references are tailored to the end user. Even if the references were combined, they would be inoperable for their intended purpose, which is to enable different customers (e.g., catalog producers, who may be retailers or distributors) to generate a catalog from customized electronic data received by them.

The present invention enables a “customer” to specify those products for which data they request, as well as the languages in which that data is requested. The customer (e.g., catalog producer) may then generate a catalog from that data. The cited references merely teach displaying product data in the form of a catalog to an end user, and therefore teaches away from supporting generation of a catalog by the customer receiving the product data.


The dependent claims depend from one of independent claim 1 and are therefore patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from the cited references. For instance, claim 14 specifies that the products for which data may be received are associated with a plurality of manufacturers, rather than a single manufacturer as taught by the cited references. Hence, it is submitted that the dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. GDT1P003).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649

BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, California 94704
Tel. (510) 843-6200